



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,825	06/26/2006	Masakatsu Urairi	UNU79.070APC	3951
20995 7590 03/13/2008 KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP 2040 MAIN STREET FOURTEENTH FLOOR IRVINE, CA 92614				
EXAMINER EVANS, GEOFFREY S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1793				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/13/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jcartee@kmob.com
eOAPilot@kmob.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/584,825

Applicant(s)

URAIRI ET AL.

Examiner

Geoffrey S. Evans

Art Unit

1793

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-13, 15-19, 25 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14 and 20-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 8-11,13,15-19,25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akazawa in Japan Patent No. 2002-338,911 in view of Hammann et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,811,888 and alternatively Cole et al. in U.S. Patent No. 5,169,678 or Kang et al. in U.S. patent No. 6,255,405. Akazawa discloses a protective sheet with an associated adhesive layer for processing a semiconductor wafer with the protective sheet made of an aromatic polymer, i.e. polyimide (see paragraph 14) on top of the wafer (substrate). Hammann et al. teaches that a layer of polyimide (see column 2, line 58) can be used with an excimer laser (which is inherently ultraviolet) or an Nd:YAG laser (see column 3,lines 37-40). Cole et al. teaches using filler made of dye of

Art Unit: 1793

0.1 to 10% or more in a polymer (see column 7, lines 34-47) to increase the laser ablatability of the polymer. Alternatively Kang et al. (405) teaches using a filler material of 20% or less of the polymer (see column 11, lines 40-42) to increase the absorption of ultraviolet light by the polymer. It would have been obvious to adapt Akazawa et al. in view of Hammann et al. to provide this to use the polymer sheet of Hammann et al. to protect the workpiece and to further adapt the polymer sheet with the filler materials of either Cole et al. or Kang et al. to provide this to permit the laser beam to more easily machine a hole in the polymer sheet so that the laser beam subsequently can machine the workpiece (wafer). Using a protective sheet with a tensile strength of 100 MPa or more would be obvious since it would match the tensile strength of known polymer circuit boards.

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akazawa in view of Hammann et al., Cole et al. or Kang et al. as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Chang et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,864,459 or De Steur et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,610,960. Chang et al. teaches using a wavelength of 355 nm to laser drill a hole (see column 7, line 2). Alternatively De Steur et al. teaches using a laser beam with a wavelength of 355 nm (see column 6, line 19) to laser drill a hole. It would have been obvious to adapt Akazawa et al. in view of Hammann et al., Cole et al., or Kang et al. and either Chang et al. or De Steur et al. to provide this to laser drill a hole with this known common wavelength.

5. Applicant's arguments filed 21 December 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Cole et al. and Kang et al. (405) disclose using filler material

within the range of 2-20% by weight as to increase absorbance of ultraviolet light by the polymer.

6. Claims 14,20-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Capote et al. in U.S. Patent No. 5,538,789 discloses a polyimide film with a tensile strength of 231 MPa (see column 9, lines 10-29) in a circuit board. Ding et al. in U.S. Patent No. 5,981,145 discloses a filler dye for absorbing ultraviolet light in a polymer.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Geoffrey S. Evans whose telephone number is (571)-272-1174. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:00AM to 3:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571)-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Geoffrey S Evans/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793
Geoffrey S Evans
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1793

GSE